



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

HL

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/182,645 10/30/98 LI

J 23737

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.,
1100 NORTH GLEBE ROAD
8TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON VA 22201

HM12/1201

EXAMINER

WANG, S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1617

DATE MAILED:

12/01/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/182,645

Applicant(s)

LI ET AL.

Examiner

Shengjun Wang

Art Unit

1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claims 1-3 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:
1. ☐ received.
2. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) ____.
3. ☐ received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 14) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 15) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 16) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 17) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 18) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 19) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1617

Election/Restrictions

1. Rule 126 requires the claims to be consecutively numbered. Therefore, since the original claims have been numbered by applicant as 1-35 and 37-39, applicant's claims 37-39 have been renumbered as 36-38. Applicant is requested to note the dependency of renumbered claim 36. It has not been altered.

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claim 1-25 and 38, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition, classified in class 514, subclass 22, 25 and 46.
- II. Claim 26-37, drawn to a process of using the pharmaceutical composition for treating disease, classified in class 514, subclass 22, 25 and 46.

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the process for treating neurologic disorders as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product such as composition comprising PARP inhibitors.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 1617

3. If applicant elected group I, a further election of species is required. The claims are directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

IA. Claims 5-7 and 16-19, drawn to a composition employing glucose derivative, classified in class 514, subclass 25.

IB. Claims 8 and 9, drawn to a composition employing hydrolysable tannin, classified in class 514, subclass 25.

IC. claims 10-12 and 20-22, drawn to a composition employing lignin glucoside, classified in class 514, subclass 22;

ID. Claims 13, 14 and 23-25, drawn to a composition employing adenosine derivative classified in class 514, subclass 46.

These species are distinct from each other because of their widely varying chemical structures which can render them various distinct chemical and physiological properties. Further, the varying structures would render the species different classification and therefore the search for all species would present an undue burden on the examiner.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, Claims 1-4, 15 and 38 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Art Unit: 1617

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

4. If applicant elected group II, a further election of species is required. The claims are directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

IIA. Claims 28-31, drawn to a composition employing glucose derivative, classified in class 514, subclass 25.

IIB. Claims 32-34, drawn to a composition employing lignin glucoside, classified in class 514, subclass 22;

IIC. Claims 35-37, drawn to a composition employing adenosine derivative, classified in class 514, subclass 46.

These species are distinct from each other because of their widely varying chemical structures which can render them various distinct chemical and physiological properties. Further,

Art Unit: 1617

the varying structures would render species different classification and therefore the search for all species would present an undue burden on the examiner.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, Claims 26 and 27 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the

Art Unit: 1617

currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

6. Telephone communication is not required where (1) the restriction is complex, (2) the application is being prosecuted by the applicant *pro se*, or (3) the examiner knows from past experience that an election will not be made by telephone (MPEP 812.01). In the instant case, the restriction is complex. Therefore, a telephone call to applicant's agent was not made to request an oral election herein.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shengjun Wang whose telephone number is (703) 308-4554. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald E. Adams, can be reached on (703) 308-0570. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4553.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.


MINNA MOEZIE
PRIMARY EXAMINER